DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 225 607 JC 820 567

AUTHOR	Koltai, Leslie
TITLE	State of the District Address, 1982.
INSTITUTION	Los Angeles Community Coll. District, Calif.
PUB DATE	3 Nov 82
NOTE	18p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Basic Skills; Community Colleges; *Educational Change; Educational Finance; Educational Quality; *Financial Support; *Futures (of Society); Multicampus Districts; Program Development; Remedial Programs; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*Los Angeles Community Colleges CA

ABSTRACT

This address by the Chancellor of the Los Angeles Community College District (LACCD) discusses recent and long-term changes in the district's programs, educational quality, and financial standing, and suggests means for future improvements. First, the paper highlights the district's achievements in improving transfer education and developing new high technology training programs. The paper then examines changes in education over the past decade, citing societal influences and enrollment trends and placing special focus on the deficiencies in many students' writing and communication skills. Suggestions are then offered for improving remedial programs in response to these deficiencies. Next, the paper explains plans to establish a Commission for the Advancement of Teaching to, for example, assess faculty needs, establish principles for basic skills instruction, and promote computer literacy. After commenting on the future of community services in the LACCD, the paper considers district funding problems, strategies in developing the 1983-84 budget, and financial priorities. Finally, possible methods for dealing with financial stress are identified, including reevaluation of programs, improvement in productivity, increases in fund-raising activities, and the attraction of private donations; and the undesirability of the alternatives of employee retrenchment and fee increases is stressed. (DAB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED225607

STATE OF THE DISTRICT ADDRESS

1982

Chancellor Leslie Koltai

November 3, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Koltai

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization orginating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 820 567

1982 STATE OF THE DISTRICT ADDRESS

Dr. Leslie Koltai
Chancellor
Los Angeles Community College District
November 3, 1982

It is gratifying to see so many colleagues here today for the annual State of the District address, which provides us with an opportunity to take a look at where we have been and to set our goals for the coming year.

Last year, I identified several areas which I suggested be given greater attention and positive action. These areas included the need to increase the completion rate in our transfer programs, and the development of new high technology training programs. There have been a number of significant positive changes in both areas.

TRANSFER EDUCATION

In terms of transfer education, it appears that this district's attention to the problem has resulted in many activities and new approaches. Last year, I indicated to you that I would be establishing a Commission on Transfer Education to study the problem and to make appropriate recommendations. The Commission has identified a number of significant issues, such as: student assessment and academic placement, appropriate use of counseling curriculum changes in general education, and improved articulation with four-year institutions.

In the area of student assessment, the Commission recommends that a District Assessment and Placement Task Force be formed composed of teaching faculty experts in reading comprehension, writing and composition, and in algebra and mathematical skills, assisted by psychometric experts and appropriate counseling service representatives and administrators.

It is interesting to note that one of the Commission's recommended objectives for the Task Force is a determination of what minimal basic skill levels are desirable for entry level transfer courses in the various disciplines.

In the area of general education and curriculum, it is necessary that we continue to probe the content of core curriculum and its impact on vocational education majors.

The Commission also addressed itself to the problem of substance in the articulation process. The Commission endorsed the idea of continuous dialogue with four-year institutions, but emphasized the role of faculty discipline committees. One aspect of this dialogue is a conscious awareness of changes in teaching philosophy and methodology presently emerging in universities.

The Commission, in its report soon to be released, reemphasizes counseling's significant role in the community colleges. The new academic standards policy and the new requirements instituted by four-year institutions place heavy burdens on our counseling services. The largest number of recommendations in the study relates to counseling, and it is our plan to work together in order to bring counseling closer to the mainstream of our educational efforts.

We hope to see the Commission continue its efforts, and I want to take this opportunity to express my appreciation to the chairman of the Commission, Gene Pimentel, the President of the District Faculty Senate, Dr. Pat Blakeslee and members of the Commission.

The desire to improve our transfer education permeates our campuses. Transfer committee have been established on each campus, and there have been regularly scheduled Transfer Workshops. Transfer Days have been held at some colleges to acquaint students with options for continuing their education. Generally, there has been greater interaction of faculty and counseling staff in working with those students who have set their sights on a baccalaureate degree.

It is worthwhile to take a look at some of the colleges.

For example, under the leadership of Dr. Mary Lee, president of Los Angeles Valley College, the faculty and administration established subcommittees to evaluate course scheduling prerequisites, and recruitment; counselors distributed specially-prepared packets of information on the transfer program; printed schedules directed primarily toward assisting transfer students in selecting the appropriate courses; and developed work sheets for programming the course sequence for the baccalaureate major and general education requirements.

At Los Angeles City College, articulation committees were formed with several schools at UCLA to establish communication networks and to facilitate transfer. UCLA provided an early identification list of City College students applying for the Fall semester, and counseling appointments were made. In addition, a Transfer Center has been established at City College to make information and four-year institution spokespersons available to our students.

I am happy to report to you that we have started a pilot transfer project at three of our campuses – Los Angeles Harbor, Mission, and Trade-Technical Colleges. This project, conducted in cooperation with the American College Testing Program, will be focused on disadvantaged students and will assist them in reaching their stated educational goals. Project ASSET – which stands for Assessment of Skills for Successful Entry and Transfer – will have seven major emphases, such as: identification/recruitment, assessment, counseling, instruction, retention, transfer, and follow-up.

In addition to our three colleges, we have a number of four-year colleges and universities participating.

The first step of the project – the administration of an assessment instrument at each of the three participating colleges – is already completed. The assessment instrument includes components for reading skills, language usage skills, numerical and algebra skills. We are most anxious to see the results of this effort.

There are many other activities which I believe lead to strengthening our transfer and general education programs.

Just last week a workshop on Transfer, Honors and Excellence was held at Los Angeles Harbor College, sponsored by the LACCD Center for Professional Development and the Center for the Study of Community Colleges, under grants from the Andrew W. Mellon and Ford Foundations. The large turnout at the meeting suggests a growing interest in our staff in delivering a more structured academic program to the students of our district.

We are in a leadership position in this project, and the Harbor workshop was the first in a series of national workshops on the following topics: Defining the Curriculum: Liberal Arts Career Options, Interdisciplinary Programs in St. Louis; Interdisciplinary Studies in Phoenix; Defining the Associate Degree in Miami; Liberal Arts in Occupational Areas in Dallas; and Student Academic Support Systems in Chicago.

We are making our institutional emphasis on transfer felt. In summary, the Los Angeles Community College District is becoming more directive, more supportive, and more demanding of our students so that they can be more successful in their transfer plans.

HIGH TECH ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Last year I also emphasized the need for updating our high technology programs.

Our districtwide efforts to strengthen existing high technology offerings and to initiate new programs under the California Worksite Education and Training Act, and through contract arrangements, led to significant accomplishments under the leadership of Ms. Linda Thor, director of High Technology Services.

The latest recognition of our strong interest in high technology resulted in the State of California granting more than $700,000 to our district in the following areas:

- Close to $300,000 for programs at Los Angeles Trade-Technical College in the area of digital technician, electronics technician, and others.
- Close to $150,000 for the development of a mobile microwave training program. Since microwave training is cost-intensive, we planned an innovative delivery system at worksites by utilizing mobile microwave laboratories for this purpose. This is a cooperative venture with the College of San Mateo.
- Two projects were funded at Los Angeles Harbor College in the areas of information processing and industrial technology. The approximately $185,000 grant will have a significant impact in the Harbor area.
- A $75,000 project for an intensive mini-computer maintenance program at Los Angeles City College was requested by both students and industry.

All of these projects are part of the Investment in People program.

The $3 million CWETA grant enabled us to develop in a relatively short time a network of employment-based programs through out colleges. Just to give you a vew examples of these projects, at Powertec in Chatsworth the upgrading of electronics assemblers to test technicians is being so well received at the worksite that even the company is promoting the program to neighboring electronics firms.

We are also working with Pacific Telephone to provide computer-inactive upgrade training for 160 employees. And Charlotte Arrick of Pacific Telephone is now with us as an "executive on loan" to serve as a liaison with industry as well as to assist in development of new programs.

Programs with Fairchild Control Systems Company and California Cable Television Association, a microwave training project and a mobile training laboratory, are other significant accomplishments our district has achieved in a very short time.

May I note that the programs I mentioned earlier – in addition to being modern, high technology projects – also help us to address society's unemployment problem

as well as that of displaced workers.

I believe we can be an important contributor to the economic development of the community we serve and to ease the problems of the unemployed and underemployed.

We are also actively involved in the development of the Los Angeles County Business Labor Advisory Council, which will bring industry and labor together with educational providers.

There is a new essential partnership developing between community colleges and the people of the State which can significantly contribute to the economic well-being of Californians. By meeting the needs for a trained and knowledgeable workforce, we will not only encourage growth and strength of native businesses but will attract new industries as well.

We are not alone in this effort. For example, North and South Carolina invested $80 million in high technology. Today, these centers are credited with bringing $11 billion worth of new industry to the Carolinas.

I hope that this district is actively committed to doing what it can to make sure that Californians are put back to work and get their money's worth.

In summary, a less-than-one-year effort in high technology training, which led to new partnerships with business, industry, and labor, and largely funded by the State, is a good example of our district's efforts to stay in the forefront of modern vocational education.

THE ECOLOGY OF EDUCATION

It was ten years ago that I came to this district as Chancellor. This has been a decade filled with challenges and many changes. It has also been a decade of what Dr. Lawrence Cremin, president of Columbia Teachers College, calls a revolution in society and education as we adapt to the "relentless technological advances of the modern era."[1]

As you recall in his lecture at last year's Chancellor's Colloquium, he said there has been a fundamental change in the ecology of education – where it takes place, how it takes place, and with what intensity, power and effect it takes place. Dr. Cremin listed three main mitigating factors.

The first is the continuing evolution and diversification of family and kinship systems – which have a tremendous impact upon the educational background a student brings to the classroom, as well as the ways in which instruction is perceived.

Second is the tremendous influence of television which, as Dr. Cremin points out, educates and miseducates with a dynamism and an engagement that the classroom often cannot duplicate. Coupled with the burgeoning use of micro-computers, we are seeing an array of telecommunications possibilities unparalleled in modern life.

Third, the nature of work is also in flux as we change from an economy dependent upon machinery and production into the management of knowledge and information. There are new work roles and jobs that probably didn't even exist 25 years ago.

In this ecology of education, as he called it, community colleges are occupying the most significant domain. More than 4½ million students nationwide benefit from a new societal institution – an original American invention: the community college.

In a historical perspective, there was very little discussion about the mission of the community college in the '60s and '70s when the national compulsion to provide "instant equity" to the socially, professionally and educationally disenfranchised opened the door to higher education. But Harvard researcher Patricia Cross said: "We have probably proved that we can deliver on our promise to open the doors of access to college. But we have not demonstrated that we can deliver an education that is attractive and useful to the majority of Americans. . . . If the Access Model is to have meaning, it must be supported by a Learning Model that makes access to higher education more than a hollow victory."

Last year, I said that "the Los Angeles Community College District has always occupied a leadership role in terms of quality education and academic change."

I believe that the learning model Dr. Cross talked about is the need for significant increase in time on tasks and involvement in learning by the community college student.

One of my friends commented that the best way to enhance student learning is to make every student a teacher assistant. When students are participants in the direction and delivery of their education, then the most effective transmission of knowledge takes place.

We cannot look at community colleges and quality teaching without first looking at the students our colleges serve. Community colleges today are often multicultural, multi-ethnic towers of Babel with disadvantaged, extremely mobile – and even transient – students.

A ten-year review of the Los Angeles Community College District enrollment shows that white student population decreased from 57 percent in 1972 to 38 percent in 1981; Asian students increased from 5 percent in 1972 to 12 percent in 1981; the increase among Hispanics was from 15 percent to 23 percent; and among black students, from 20 percent to 24 percent.

It is also interesting to note that there is a continuous increase in part-time students. In Fall 1981, more than 75 percent of our students were part-time, compared to 66 percent in 1972.

This Fall, because of reductions in instructional programs, enrollment declined 2.5 percent. This decrease was primarily in evening enrollment because of cutbacks in course offerings. Day enrollment actually increased 1.9 percent. The average weekly student contact hours rose slightly for the first time since 1973 to 9.42 per student.

This continuous demand for community college education suggests that students feel comfortable in our colleges. They are involved in human contacts – through mentoring, counseling, advisement – or just a good faculty-student relationship.

Many students come to us from families who are far from affluent, who strive to improve their earning potential. The Fall, 1980 student survey shows that, among students living at home, 49 percent report annual parental incomes under $18,000; 23 percent indicate incomes under $9,000. Personal incomes of less than $3,000 were reported by 36 percent of our students.

Many of these students represent the first generation of their families to attend college, suggesting that they need even more help with how to survive on campus, or how to avail themselves of the support services needed for their collegiate success.

Classrooms are still filled with relatively unpracticed learners whose elementary and secondary school experiences have been limited in obtaining academic or vocational skills, or appropriate study habits. These are students who have never been required to meet traditional educational standards.

Faculty members say that their greatest instructional difficulty lies in dealing with the large variation in skills their students bring to class. Quite often, an instructor will find that reading competency levels within a single class will vary by six or more grade levels, making coherent, consistent, meaningful classroom presentation a virtual miracle.

The situation is compounded by the fact that the knowledge that students do possess is often fragmented, with little or no awareness of, or experience in, connecting those fragments.

Ernest Boyer, president of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, has observed: "We've allowed the individual to define education in his or her own terms, and in the process, we've neglected our responsibility to set forth larger visions," to define the framework within which information gains relevance.

WRITING SKILLS DEFICIENT

The underlying issue here is that many of our students are critically deficient in their writing and communications skills. Since instruction often uses symbolic systems to impart information, we must realize that many of our students almost assuredly will have difficulties under this mode. We must be aware that even the ability to understand our instruction is affected by verbal ability, writing proficiency, and reading comprehension. A lack of literate skills can cripple an otherwise able and ambitious man or woman . . . in college – and in life.

John Grede, retired vice chancellor of the City College of Chicago, and Jack Friedlander, of the Center for the Study of Community Colleges, have estimated that more than half of all students entering community colleges "read below the eighth grade level and nearly a third read below the fourth-grade level."[2]

The California Postsecondary Education Commission recently surveyed California's public colleges and universities to determine what kinds of remedial programs were offered in basic skills and what enrollment changes had occurred from 1978-79 to 1980-81. Their preliminary report, *Promises to Keep*, verified that all segments offered remedial courses in reading, writing, mathematics, and English as a Second Language (ESL). The proportion of remedial courses in English and mathematics was understandably highest at community colleges, with open admission policies. Forty-five percent of the community college English enrollment was found to be remedial and 57 percent of the math enrollment, using the Commission's course definitions was remedial. Increases were generally greater, however, among the other segments. Enrollment in ESL classes has grown tremendously from 62 percent to 87 percent among the segments.

According to J. Conrad Glass, Jr., and Lee McGraw Hoffman of the Department of Adult and Community College Education at North Carolina State University, writing problems are often combined with a limited vocabulary, difficulty in using abstract symbols, poor syntax, difficulty in developing verbal thought sequences,

restricted verbal comprehension, and an over-reliance on non-verbal communication.[3]

The problem is not limited to one discipline; neither should the solution.

But there is cause for optimism. Educational theorists, such as Benjamin Bloom of the University of Chicago, say that more than 90 percent of our population can learn any subject if the right instructional mode is used and enough time is taken.[4].

And John Roueche, professor at the University of Texas, has extensively studied the student we are speaking about. He found that student success is in a large degree related to teacher expectations as well as to the college's success in developing greater responsibility in its students.[5]

Roueche also says that students can succeed when they are offered an "attractive invitation to learn mediated through a person."

The community college faculty member is the "person." We have to give hope, the secret of motivation, to the student. As educators, one of our first tasks has been to develop curiosity in our students about their own capabilities – and then to encourage them to take the risk to find out just what those capabilities are. We must give them hope that they will not once again meet with failure and disappointment. We must encourage them to share our confidence in their ability. We must show them that they can indeed hit what they aim at.

We must get our faculty and support instructional personnel more involved in working with students, in guiding them as they proceed through our institutions.

Today's students don't need as wide a range of choices as they have had in the past. They've been confronted – and confounded – by options throughout their secondary and postsecondary career. They now need directions, guidance, advice, and a caring commitment on the part of their instructors and advisors.

Or, to quote Roueche and Armes, high-risk students need direction in order "to demonstrate success in a limited number of courses before taking on greater course loads. So many times, these students are giving formal education a last brave try."[6]

By the way, for their book, *The American Community College*, Arthur Cohen and Florence Brawer surveyed 6,000 students in the state of Washington, and they confirmed something we should not find surprising: "Students take the courses that they are required to take; if students are asked to take more, they do; those who take more courses feel they have learned more."[7]

And Professor Cohen concluded, "for too long we have accepted the pernicious notion that students will define their own best learning paths, plan their own curriculums, spend time on what is best for them." But he says that, "as professional educators, we have a responsibility to tell people what they should know, for their own good and for the good of society."

I suggest to you that what we need is a more collegiate environment where student-faculty relationship is increased and is more meaningful. As we hope to develop this new connection, we must prepare our faculty to deal with the multiple issues they face in the classroom, above and beyond teaching disciplines. Unfortunately, if we cannot improve our ability to deal with the problems students bring to class, they will reach the final choice none of us want – drop out.

Therefore, we must emphasize the need for completion of a course, a program, a major field of study. It can be the hallmark of our instruction if we would suggest to

the students that their investment of time and energy in study – or a completion of educational effort – is the sign of ultimate success in life.

Let us look at the same issue from the teacher's – the faculty's – point of view. I believe that the problem of completion also refers to the fact that in the '60s and '70s, in the name of access, there were very few prerequisites and little emphasis on sequential learning. In fact, the traditional liberal arts transfer program changed during those years into liberal arts transferable programs. The result is a "flattened-out" community college curriculum.

If a measure of success is the persistence of students to sophomore standing, only 16 percent of this district's Fall, 1982 students were sophomores – that is, with 30 to 60 units. This proportion is down from 23 percent in 1973.

The number of degrees and certificates awarded has also dropped from 9,233 in 1972-73 to 7,645 in 1981-82. We have a tremendous amount of homework to do in this regard.

We can assume that access can be improved if we confront the student with clear expectations of defined priorities, of prerequisites for sequential enrollment, and of academic standards.

In other words, we need to work together to prepare ourselves for teaching more effectively the multi-ethnic, multi-cultural, multi-lingual student mix present in our classroom today. We need to work on classroom management, on how to give and grade essays, on how to teach and take stress in a heterogeneous environment, realizing that – for some of us – an academic background in letters and sciences did not provide heavy emphasis on selection of appropriate instructional methodology.

We need to get involved in updating our teaching skills – particularly in the areas of composition, English as a Second Language, and mathematics, as well as in data interpretation and the use of computers in the instructional arena.

We have had some valuable experiences in the area of joint ventures. Thanks to the leadership of Trustee Wallace Albertson, this district was able to develop a Faculty Institute for Basic Skills Instruction with the California State University system, in which more than 200 faculty members participated in 1981-82. There were a variety of activities, including workshops in writing instruction and English as a Second Language.

The State University system was unable to continue funding this year; but this district is continuing to pursue opportunities for faculty renewal.

In cooperation with UCLA, we are now offering a series of seminars for 100 teachers of writing, continuing support for special tutorial writing laboratories, and in the Spring, campus-level workshops on Writing Across the Disciplines will be available to help faculty incorporate literacy instruction into their class work.

A handbook on writing composition for students in our English as a Second Language classes, funded through a grant from the Community College Fund for Instructional Improvement, is scheduled to be ready for distribution soon.

But we need to do more.

OFFERING A REMEDY

These days, any discussion of basic skills eventually turns into a discussion of remedial education – and this will be no exception.

Some call this type of instruction "remedial" – it offers a remedy. Others call it "developmental," while others prefer the term "pre-collegiate." But no matter what label we attach, we need to deal with the issue. And we need to do it now.

Community colleges lie between the public school system and the university, in that much of what we do is determined by the needs and achievements of those two sectors. Nowhere is this more true than in terms of remedial – developmental – or pre-collegiate – education.

This is a difficult area to assess, since the need for developmental education varies so greatly from student to student. Our developmental courses serve those with real learning handicaps, those who are underprepared, as well as those who face a language barrier due to immigration to this country.

Among other things, we also need to develop guidelines about how many times a student should be allowed to take a specific developmental course before we determine that enough is enough.

We need pre- and post-test data, use of skills specialists, and closer contacts with instructor and counselor.

We must remember that it is both difficult and expensive to teach basic skills to those who failed to learn them in prior educational experiences. New sophisticated techniques are needed – because the old ones obviously didn't work.

Many of our students are already using computers. They view this phenomenon with none of the trepidation shared by many of us. They see the computer as a friend, an instrument for pleasurable challenges. There is no stigma attached to "going over to the learning center to work on the computer." If it is so programmed, the computer is also very forgiving – it forgets yesterday's failure and rewards today's successes. And we can use that aspect to make our instruction more effective.

I think what we need in this District is to bring faculty up-to-date on these methods so that they can be successfully used in the classroom.

COMMISSION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING

In order to deal with the challenge of teaching in the community colleges, I plan to establish a Commission for the Advancement of Teaching in the Los Angeles Community College District.

The Commission will have the following objectives:

1. The formulation of a faculty needs inventory for the development and application of new teaching methodologies.
2. The establishment of appropriate principles for the teaching of basic skills in the total instructional program.
3. The initiation of appropriate pedagogy for teaching computer literacy.
4. The renewal of leadership skills in classroom management.
5. The clarification of counseling and advisement in a heterogenous college environment.

It will be the Commission's objective to develop a partnership for the encouragement of faculty wellness, for recognition of the strengths – as well as the vulnerabilities – of our teaching staff.

The Center for Professional Development will serve as the focus for these efforts.

We must, in fact, recognize excellence where it exists and strive to improve the quality of instruction where improvement is possible. We have among us faculty members who continually exhibit both thorough and up-to-date mastery of their chosen fields, as well as outstanding expertise in imparting knowledge and enthusiasm to their students. Such excellence should be prized . . . and it should be shared.

I am, therefore, recommending to the Board of Trustees the establishment of Chancellor's Professorships in recognition of such excellence. Five outstanding professors, in the area of the humanities, social sciences, natural sciences, vocationnal education, and counseling and guidance, will be made available to all colleges in the district for purposes of providing assistance in upgrading instruction and counseling, and rendering academic leadership in various disciplines.

The Chancellor's Professors will share their expertise, as well, in a series of colloquia within our District. The cost of this new effort, hopefully, will be funded from private and public sources.

And, just as we are planning to honor excellence in faculty performance, so do we intend to develop a program to recognize achievement among our students. I will ask the District Faculty Senate and the Chancellor's Cabinet to take the initiative role in the development of a districtwide honors program to enable us to meet the special academic needs of students with high scholastic achievement and potential.

Such a program could include special classes, in-course honors activities, colloquia, forums, workshops, lectures, inter-disciplinary studies, individual mentoring, and special academic and career counseling.

We need to develop experiences for gifted minority students, who require encouragement and recognition in order to realize the greatest possible benefit from their college years.

Of course, there are many other important projects that we are working on. One of the most important assignments, in which we are all involved now, is the preparation of our General Education requirements.

The topics I have been discussing – transfer education, vocational education, remediation, faculty and student enrichment, honors programs, general education requirements – are all important components of our educational delivery system. I believe we meet the needs of our metropolitan community. After all, this is part of our tradition.

Nowhere has this emphasis been felt more strongly than in the area of community services which, during the '60s and '70s, became the focus of greater community and institutional interest.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

After Proposition 13, however, funds budgeted for California community service offerings dropped by 62 percent. And, with more recent budget cut-backs, the emphasis has been placed on the development of self-supporting offerings that are capable of garnering strong local involvement.

Community services have continued to mushroom throughout California into what is becoming a major enterprise as focus shifts to self-supporting programs. This

district's primary concern, of course, is educational quality, which is why we are working on a districtwide criteria by which we can measure prospective offerings while building a framework for a sound funding base.

Toward this end, within a short time, I will be submitting to the Board a set of recommendations on the future of community services in the Los Angeles Community College District. My goal is to develop and to utilize the capabilities of the existing community services system, and to maximize the strengths of a large district through such possibilities as districtwide community service program development, marketing, registration, and computer support.

ECOLOGY OF FUNDING

In today's environment, it is clear that no discussion of educational issues can take place without also examining the ecology of funding for our educational enterprise. There is a direct relationship between educational need and available financial resources.

Lyman A. Glenny and Frank M. Bowen, in their reports to the California Postsecondary Education Commission, listed a number of indicators, or early warning signs of financial stress.

A review of the list suggests that, in many respects, we can already observe at least three signals of stress.

1. We can no longer make long-range decisions that depend on continued state support.

   - With the passage of Proposition 13, the state assumed primary responsibility for the funding of community colleges. As long as the state had reserves, this funding was adequate. However, with the passage of finance legislation for the 1981-82 fiscal year, it became evident that the state had insufficient funds to continue that support. Moreover, uncertainty over how best to allocate available funds created additional stress due to the inability to adequately plan educational operations for more than a year at a time.

   - The cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) from the state for 1981-82 was 5 percent, a reduction of 3.9 percentage points from the prior year. For 1982-83, the COLA was zero. This reduction in support over a two-year period meant a loss of $14 million for the Los Angeles Community College District.

   - The requirement to reduce statewide apportionment by $30 million involving the reclassification of courses is one other indicator of the impact on community colleges of state fiscal problems.

2. The district has seen dramatic reductions to its ending balances.

   - As support from the state for community colleges was reduced, the Los Angeles Community College District began to utilize balances to delay the im-

pact of this reduction on programs and services. The use of these balances, in particular those tied to projects in the Special Reserve Fund, is another obvious indicator of stress. The commitment of long-term savings reserved for necessary capital improvement projects must be seen as a fateful decision which sacrifices the future for immediate operational needs.

- During the 1980-81 fiscal year, general fund balances were reduced approximately $15 million as a result of insufficient funding by the state, coupled with increased costs due to inflation. During the 1981-82 fiscal year, ending balances were reduced a further $22.1 million. Finally, for the 1982-83 fiscal year, it is estimated that there will be no uncommitted balances in the general fund, and that the district will have consumed in excess of $15 million of balances in the Special Reserve Fund.

3. The district has begun to experience cash flow difficulties.

- Because of cash flow problems, there exists the possibility that payrolls will not be made and bills will go unpaid. For the first time in the history of the Los Angeles Community College District, there is this possibility. The presence of cash flow difficulties is due in part to the change in the state mechanism for distributing apportionment – caused by the State's own fiscal problems – which has reduced advance apportionment from 70 percent of the estimated total to 60 percent. However, it is due principally to the elimination of district cash balances, which have been substantial in the prior years. The end of the 1981-82 fiscal year saw the district with less than $4 million in cash, as compared to an excess of $27 million at the close of the 1980-81 fiscal year.

The signals of distress command very careful planning for the 1983-84 academic year. In addition to enrollment planning, we must carefully evaluate our programs and activities in light of financial uncertainties. In the process of reassessment, I would like to involve the faculty, administration, and the supporting staff in developing a mechanism for setting priorites and reaching decisions.

I believe that the faculty's involvement in this reassessment process is of critical importance. In the upcoming months, while we plan to work with the legislators to obtain appropriate financing for our programs, we will still be facing a $20 to $25 million problem. Unfortunately, even if we will manage the situation, we will not be able to do so without discomfort and even – in some cases – severe dislocation for our personnel.

Development of our budget for 1983-84 will, of necessity, be unique in relationship to the successful process of the past because of several factors, including the State's fiscal environment, the lateness of information we receive from the State, and the impact of a new governor in Sacramento.

In our 1983-84 budget preparation, we should develop the following strategies. First, establish a Chancellor's Advisory Committee on Institutional Reassessment composed of representatives from the collective bargaining units, administration,

management, and students. This group should be an active participant in representing the needs and concerns of the various segments of the college community, and assist us in communicating to the various constituencies about internal and external considerations which affect the budget preparation.

Second, a combination of staffing adjustments, administrative consolidation, course offering cutbacks, and program termination will be considered. I believe that the cumulative effect of savings from each segment can be substantial.

Finally, we should develop strong leadership on campuses and in the district office in order to develop adequate response to decline. It is our job to find the balance between the educational needs of this district and the available financial resources of the State. This is a difficult task.

As part of this effort, we must take the initiative and make every effort to ensure adequate State funding for our district.

I would like to take this opportunity – the earliest possible – to congratulate the Governor-Elect, George Deukmejian, and present him with our priorities for financing community colleges in 1983-84.

First and foremost is the repair of our fiscal base. The lack of adequate inflation dollars in 1981-82 and 1983-84 should be corrected in 1983-84. As just mentioned, this would bring in an additional $14 million. Even more important, the district base must be adjusted for the $7 million in lost COLA due to equalization.

The concept of revenue equalization has been an issue for this district since 1979. The concept of revenue differences between low cost and high cost districts has totally failed to recognize the costs associated with operating an educational institution in an urban environment. Our second priority, then, is the recognition by the State of these costs and support for our efforts to serve that community with the greatest and most urgent need of our services.

Third, recognition of the importance of maintaining the district's capital investments – not only in facilities but, in particular, the books and materials housed in those facilities. We ask for consideration of categorical funding to maintain our libraries and learning resource centers. Additionally, we ask for increased funding for deferred maintenance which is becoming more critical as our facilities age.

Finally, we ask the State to establish its educational priorities and to fund them accordingly. I am confident the Los Angeles Community College District, with its commitment to transfer education, vocational training, and remediation, mirrors the priorities of the State.

We realize that these priorities may require an increase in State taxes, either special or general, or both, but we call upon Governor-Elect Deukmejian to reverse the decline and then repair the damage that has been done to education in California. We believe that Mr. Deukmejian is well suited to this challenge, both by virtue of his experience in the area of marshalling competing political interests toward necessary tax increases and by recognition of the political maxim that, as the state leader of his party, his personal and candid recognition of the need of increased taxes would be more favorably received by those who might otherwise not be convinced.

THE ECOLOGY OF DECLINING RESOURCES

We must recognize, however, that this will be a very tough, hard-fought year in

Sacramento. Our success in obtaining additional revenue is anything but secure. Therefore, we must face the fact of retrenchment. One of our biggest problems in this process is and will continue to be: What are we going to be able to do for our employees who are being asked to do more with less? It is our goal to minimize layoffs in these austere times and use every means possible to reduce the ill effects of retrenchment on our employees.

The reality is that, in times of financial decline, the support service usually takes a greater share of the burden of cutbacks than instructional personnel. The Los Angeles Community College District, however, has a long record of exhausting every avenue to continue the employment of its classified staff – a group that is highly valued and appreciated. It is my hope that we will be able to minimize the personal impact on our employees through such means as regionalization of shared services. And I assure all employees that we will do all we can to keep personnel adjustment to a minimum.

It should be pointed out that administrative personnel have borne a significant portion of the cutbacks so far. From June 1978 to September 1982, the number of certificated administrative positions was cut by over 24 percent – a reduction of more than 50 positions.

In terms of the management of the district, I would like to point out that our business services functions have been reorganized as a result of the consolidation of fiscal and administrative services and, also, that the Personnel Services division is reorganizing to eliminate filling vacant positions. A vice-chancellor level position has been eliminated. In the Chancellor's Office a number of administrative changes were made to decrease costs, and similar adjustments have been made in the Educational Services division. A continual review of administrative functions is in progress. Many changes are under consideration as we re-examine the distribution of the workforce within the district office and between the colleges and the divisions.

This is of critical importance because, without increased resources, improved productivity – in and out of the classroom – will be one of our highest priorities.

We hope that the colleges will improve their efforts in local fundraising activities. Auxiliary organizations have been established for Los Angeles Pierce and Los Angeles Metropolitan Colleges, and organizations for other colleges are in the planning stages.

Also on the drawing board is a districtwide auxiliary organization, which will broaden community-based support for our district through corporate, business, labor, private and public sector giving.

An ad hoc committee has been working on a proposal for this auxiliary organization, and I will be reporting back to the Board with its recommendations.

These days, statewide discussions of revenue generation usually include a discourse on fees, which this district is on record as opposing. It is early to tell what Governor – Elect Deukmejian's view will be on this issue. But, if fees are instituted, it will be important for Los Angeles to remind the State of the unique situation of our students – that many are below the poverty level and, to be equitable, any fee system must assist us in working with our students by providing us with the funds to administer the program. For, while we have implemented a user fee for parking, it is

important to note that, even with a fee, we still are not recovering our administrative costs on this program.

Statewide surveys indicate that – even with implementation of our recent fees – the Los Angeles Community College District is one of those charging the least amount of acceptable fees. We have been fair, prudent, and understanding of the plight of students seeking a higher education on our campuses. And, while other districts have attempted to impose blanket materials fees, this district will continue in its commitment to fairness in this matter.

There are other implications of tight finances as well. For the first time, completion of our facilities on campuses is now a state issue, since we have been frozen out of the market in raising taxes for initiation or completion of facilities. And, perhaps even more important, we have been placed in the unfortunate situation of being unable to deal with the deterioration of our present facilites.

In the past, our Board of Trustees placed from $1/2 to $3 million per year in deferred maintenance, but funds for this purpose have been eliminated, rendering us unable to properly maintain our facilities.

This, of course, presents us with the danger of more rapid deterioration of those facilities, and we find ourselves unable to take advantage of cost-saving, state-of-the-art technology for more energy-efficient systems.

The State is supposedly funding deferred maintenance, but restrictive financial structures tie the hands of both the Board of Trustees and administration. Our Business Services division continues to monitor this situation.

Also under the purview of this division is data processing, which has undergone a major conversion during the past year. We are now seeing the development of new systems and programs which will make our computer operation more effective and more responsive.

Other recent successes include the development of an automated ledger accounting system which has assisted us in audits and management information through monthly accounting reports. Data processing is also working with the Commission on Transfer Education to meet our counseling and tracking goals. In addition, we expect complete implementation of on-line registration on all nine campuses within 20 months.

Data processing will also play an important part in our financial aid management, since we intend to computerize our system. We have purchased nationally-accepted packages, and they are ready to be installed.

In today's issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education, a businessman, James J. Unland, director of public finance at William Blair & Company in Chicago, offered the following advice:

"The higher-education industry can take some lessons from the recent change in the condition of our domestic automobile industry from unparalleled prosperity a decade ago to near desperation today. . . .

"Although higher-education is quite different from the automobile industry, it, too, faces the need to change in a fundamental way. . . .

"Comparisons between higher education and the automobile industry can go only so far. Colleges are not selling cars; they are educating young men and women. But the fact that the institutions will have to redesign, repackage, and sell their products

does herald a new era for higher education and the challenge equals the one that confronted the auto industry a decade ago.

"The simple problem in the auto industry was that it misjudged the consumer – in that case, people saw foreign cars as giving more value for the money, and took their custom elsewhere. The same sort of things could happen in higher education, and it could happen in a time shorter than ten years.

"Whether, and how well, higher education can respond to the challenge remains to be seen. One ingredient required for success is certain: the willingness to change."

I would like to assume that the Los Angeles Community College District will make important changes so that we can serve all who can benefit from our programs.

I thank you for your attention, and I wish you the best for the 1982-83 academic year.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Cremin, Lawrence. Chancellor's Colloquium, Los Angeles Community College District. April 29, 1982.
2. Friedlander, J., and Grede, J., "Adult Basic Education in Community Colleges," *Junior College Resource Review*. Los Angeles: ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges, August 1981. 6pp. (ED 207 649)
3. Glass, J. Conrad, Jr., and Hoffman, Lee McGraw, "Teaching of English to Undereducated Adults," *Community/Junior College Research Quarterly*, Vol. 1, Number 3, April-June 1977.
4. Bloom, B.S., "Learning for Mastery," *Evaluation Comment*. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation of Instructional Programs, University of California, 1968. p78.
5. Roueche, John E., in collaboration with Pitman, John C., *A Modest Proposal: Students Can Learn*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973. p106.
6. Roueche, John E., and Armes, Nancy R. "Basic Skills Education: Point-Counterpoint," *Community and Junior College Journal*. March 1980, Vol. 50, No. 6. p23.
7. Cohen, Arthur M., and Brawer, Florence B., *The American Community College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1982.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges

University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024
FEB 25 1983